Is There A Red Menace? P. 2

Teller and Murray Campaign ("Unscientific" and "Immoral") Against A Test Agreement, P. 4

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 20 MAY 25, 1959 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Four Powers Share A Common Illusion at Geneva

The news from Geneva is about as reliable as the briefing a man gives his wife after dinner on a quarrel which happened at the office. The blow by blow account tends imperceptibly to include not only the blows actually exchanged but those crushing remarks he would certainly have made if he had thought of them before the train passed Stamford on his way home. Each of the four big Powers has a briefing officer and each of them, like Thucydides, is free to primp up the speeches. The assembled reporters know as much about what actually happened inside the conference room as we do about what Pericles *really* said to the Athenians, which may also have been less eloquent. An enterprising reporter could attend all four briefings and collate the texts critically, as scholars do variorum readings were it not for the fact that the four briefings are simultaneous. So each nation's journalistic flock tends to pick its own *propaganda ministerium* and their readers back home are comforted by seeing in print the preconceptions they regard as objectivity.

The Secret of Perpetual Negotiation

Thus I read in the augustly impartial Associated Press from Geneva that the Soviets had "dashed Western hopes for a quick break through on a suspension of nuclear weapons tests" because they "profess to fear that reopening the technical aspects" will "delay completion of a treaty." I recall that AEC Chairman John McCone told the National Press Club here in Washington on May 5—hopefully—that he thought technical negotiations on underground and outer space tests could "take time, possibly years." Perpetual motion is still in the future but the secret of perpetual negotiation has been with us for some time.

Of no problem is this more true than the German. If cybernetics can give us a machine to play chess, it should certainly have no difficulty in constructing a metallic Foreign Minister capable of attending to international conferences on the reunification of Germany. A mechanical diplomat would have an advantage over the flesh-and-blood variety. He would not become bored with his lines, as Herter and his confreres seem to be at Geneva. He—or rather *it*—would not break down as the American official spokesman did the other day in a demonstration of human undependability and admit that, the old records having been replayed, maybe the participants would now get down to discussing the Berlin situation. Only a machine could go on suggesting without blushes that a nuclear rearmed West Germany would increase European security, or that a stable Europe could be constructed on the basis of separate peace treaties with the separate halves of a divided Germany.

Senator Mansfield made a thoughtful speech on Germany in Pittsburgh earlier this month (the text may be found at page A3874 of the May 11 *Congressional Record*). He suggested that our whole approach had been outmoded long before Khrushchev's challenge on Berlin, "the defeated Germany, the disarmed Germany, the shattered, starving Germany for which the present improvised arrangements of stability were revised no longer exists." It is an illusion to suppose, as the four Powers do, that at Geneva they are deciding the fate of Germany. Instead it is Germany—the Germany of Adenauer and Krupp—which is deciding the fate of Europe. The Berlin problem on Bonn's insistence has been rendered inextricable by a package plan which includes everything but reunification of the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox rites. The truth is that the real masters of West Germany welcome Khrushchev's challenge on Berlin as a means of maintaining tension. They don't want to negotiate until their nuclear rearmament is completed, partly at U. S. expense, and then *they* want to do the negotiating with Moscow. Krupp and Khrushchev already seem to be flirting behind the backs of the West, and the Ruhr-Rhineland industrialists may hope to negotiate a package of their own when they are ready. This might include rectification of the Oder-Neisse line, and reunification on their own terms, in return for generous credits to Russia and China plus a treaty of "friendship and neutrality" a la Ribbentrop-Molotov.

Amnesia, Too, Can Be A Weapon

The dominance of Germany in Western councils was dramatically demonstrated when Selwyn Lloyd pictured restrictions on German possession of thermonuclear weapons as an attempt to "impose certain discriminatory servitudes on Germany." This is Adenauer's language, a reversal of the position Macmillan took on his voyage of exploration to Moscow in an effort to find a basis for solution. To deny thermonuclear weapons to Germany is not "discriminatory servitude" but to save Europe and Germany itself from the danger represented by that coalition of monopoly industrialists and officer class which has produced two world wars in one generation. Little more than 20 years ago this same coalition won Western acquiescence in Hitler's rearmament on the same whisper that they would only march eastward. Amnesia seems to be a major German weapon.

Chit-Chat on Capitol Hill

"Two very prominent authorities, one on disarmament and the other on science, stated in my presence the other day their belief that we would all be dead in 10 years and that the earth would be 'an incinerated relic'."

—From the May, 1959, newsletter to constituents by Cong. Chas. O. Porter (D. Ore.).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

J. Edgar Hoover Challenged in Testimony Against Bills to Reverse Cole Ruling

Former Hennings Committee Research Chief Calls Red Menace A Myth

By Benjamin Ginzburg

We reprint here an abridged version of testimony before the House Civil Service Committee on May 14 by Benjamin Ginzburg, former research director of the Senate subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. In his testimony against pending bills to restore security procedures for non-sensitive jobs, as in his earlier testimony before the Eastland committee hearings on anti-Supreme Court legislation, Dr. Ginzburg was the one witness forthrightly to attack the myth of a domestic Red menace. His thesis may be found fully and brilliantly argued in his new book, Rededication to Freedom. (Simon and Schuster, $3.50.)

As a result of my intimate contacts with the operation of the loyalty-security programs, I became convinced that these programs, as well as the whole government campaign against domestic communism, rest on two illusions.

The first illusion is that the protections of the Bill of Rights are divisible—that we can strike out against Communists in violation of the Bill of Rights, and still keep the protections of the Bill of Rights intact for the rest of us. The second, and far more disastrous, illusion is the belief that communism in the United States poses such a life-and-death threat to the nation that it justifies laying violent hands on the Bill of Rights.

In my opinion the so-called Communist menace in the United States is an emotionally created myth. In saying this, I am far from denying the potential dangers. I have fought Communist ideas and tactics all my adult life—I fought them when some of the present advocates of government thought control were active members of the Communist Party. I still believe in fighting Communist ideas and tactics, but in accordance with our established way of life I believe that the fighting should be done by private individual and organizational effort, and not by calling in the state—the policeman—for help. For a policeman is just not equipped to be able to distinguish one political idea from another. As an illustration of this inability to tell one idea from another, I may mention that in the published record of the Greene industrial security case (which is now before the Supreme Court) we find the security officer holding that the word "liberals" is synonymous with Communists.

Only Confusing Ourselves

There is certainly no life-and-death menace today from the handful of American Communists. Their number was estimated by the *New York Times* more than a year ago as anywhere from two to five thousand, and it must be much less now. The threat of Russian communism is of course a different story, but we are meeting that threat by military and diplomatic means. I don't see how a government campaign against freedom of opinion helps us to meet that threat. On the contrary it confuses us.

In the past few years we have seen the tide of hysteria fed by the myth of the Communist menace recede bit by bit. The 1956 Supreme Court decision in the case of *Cole v. Young*, invalidating the application of the Eisenhower security program to non-sensitive positions in the Federal government, reflects this ebb in the tide of hysteria.

I do not regard the Cole decision as constituting a definitive rational solution of the security problem, as so many liberals seem to believe. Far-fetched, hysterical charges about opinions and associations make no more sense in sensitive areas of government operations than they do in non-sensitive areas. If you examine the published records in the two industrial security cases now before the Supreme Court—the William L. Greene case and the Charles Allen Taylor case—you will come away appalled by the spectacle of our great government spending literally billions of dollars in investigating and condemning people on such trivia as membership 20 years ago in the Washington Cooperative Bookshop, or attendance at a public dinner of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

I know that certain sections of the public violently disagree with my assessment of the situation. They feel that a national crisis has been posed by the Cole decision.

But I say to these people: Where is the crisis? Where is the fire? At the time the High Tribunal promulgated its ruling in 1946, Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., and Civil Service Chairman Philip Young predicted that the country would be ruined unless the court's decision was promptly overridden. Each year since that time, we have had similar predictions of impending doom. But each year—in 1956, in 1957, and in 1958—the legislation to override *Cole v. Young* failed of enactment. I challenge the supporters of this legislation to show objectively in what way the national interest has been harmed by the failure to restore security procedures for non-sensitive employees.

I say that the crisis exists only in the minds of those who proclaim it. In support of my assertion I may cite the recent statement of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in the April issue of the *FBI Enforcement Bulletin*. In that statement Mr. Hoover bemoans the present apathy in regard to the Communist menace. He calls this apathy "alarming and shameful" and attributes it to a "deceitful Red plot."

Why the Public Yawns

What Mr. Hoover is saying in effect is that the American people after having been indoctrinated for 20 years with the notion of a life-and-death Communist menace in the United States is today inclined to yawn when the Red threat is brought up. If there was any substantial reality to the Red menace in the United States, there would be no need of forced draft propaganda in order to sell the American people on the Communist threat.

I submit that no overriding legislation ought to be passed by the Congress without first finding out objectively whether a serious Communist menace exists in the United States. I propose to you, as I proposed to the Internal Security Subcommittee, that an impartial non-political body such as the Social Science Research Council be invited to name a committee of social and political scientists to conduct a scientific inquiry into the gravity of the domestic Communist threat.

Three Liberal Senators Join Dirksen and Mundt in Tributes to J. Edgar Hoover

"Mr. Hoover and his FBI . . . have avidly protected the rights of the accused." —*Proxmire*

"I think it is fortunate to have as the head of the FBI an individual like Mr. Hoover who has likewise been concerned about civil liberties and civil rights."—*Neuberger*

"I wish to associate myself with the fine comments my colleagues have made with respect to J. Edgar Hoover, especially for . . . his deep understanding of the need for the preservations of the constitutional freedoms which are involved in his work." —*Javits*

From the tributes (mostly rightist) in the Senate May 11 on the 35th anniversary of J. Edgar Hoover's directorship of the FBI. Nobody, of course, mentioned Hoover's admiration for McCarthy, his close cooperation with the House Un-American Activities Committee, the aid he gave Brownell in launching the "20 years of treason" charge against the Democrats in 1953, nor the growing number of noted FBI informers who have been adjudged perjurers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hazardous Type Reactor Approved for Detroit Despite Adverse Safety Report

Why Organized Labor Has Joined in the Fight Against Strauss

The fight on the Strauss nomination is far from over. Senator Anderson is encouraged by the one-vote margin which is all that the pro-Strauss forces were able to muster in reporting the nomination out of Commerce Committee. The odds are still in favor of confirmation but grow steadily slimmer. The outcome may depend on any new revelations Anderson can make on the Senate floor and on the strength the utility interests spear-headed by A. T. & T. can mobilize for Strauss.

Organized labor finally entered the fight against confirmation when James B. Carey of the Electrical Workers appeared to testify against Strauss on May 13. Carey put on the record the story of the suit brought by the Auto Workers, the Electrical Workers and the United Papermakers challenging the conditional AEC permit granted Detroit Edison for the construction of the Lagoona Beach reactor.

Behind the suit lies the insistence of Strauss—despite an adverse safety report—in speeding the erection of a new and hazardous type of reactor in the heart of a great industrial area. The Lagoona Beach site, opposite Windsor, Canada, is 12 miles from Toledo and 30 miles from Detroit. About 2,225,000 people live within a radius of 30 miles.

The British Chose A Remote Spot for Theirs

The British, in building a fast breeder reactor of this type, chose about as remote a point as they could find in the British Isles—Dounreay in the far north of Scotland. Unlike other reactors these fast breeders do not have a moderator to slow down their neutrons, and can "run away", i.e. get out of control, in two ten-thousandths of a second. EBR-1, the first model plant, in Idaho, "ran away" in November, 1955, but Strauss went ahead with the Detroit plant without waiting for the second model, EBR-II, to be tried out. The Detroit plant was rushed to head off the growing demand in Congress for a public atomic power program.

The model which "ran away" was built by the Bechtel Corporation, headed by John McCone, whom Strauss picked as his successor as chairman of AEC. During hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy last February, McCone admitted to Senator Hickenlooper in another context that he thought it "bad timing" to go ahead with the Detroit plant without waiting for the results from the second model plant.

Carey told the Senate Committee that Strauss authorized construction of the Lagoona Beach plant although the AEC's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards advised against it on health and safety grounds. The adverse report was made on June 6, 1956 but knowledge of it was withheld from the House Appropriations Committee when Admiral Strauss on June 25 advised the committee that he had been invited to ground breaking ceremonies for the reactor on August 8, 1956. "These plans were made," Carey testified, "and the invitation accepted, despite the adverse report, and despite the fact that a construction permit had not yet been issued."

AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray disclosed the adverse report to the Appropriations Committee four days later.

Physicists Vote 'No'

Senator Douglas (D. Ill.) sent a letter to 720 members of the American Physical Society in Illinois (which includes some of our most important atomic establishments) asking their advice on confirmation of Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce. He reported to the Senate on Friday, May 15, that of 252 replies received by noon of that day, 63 percent were against confirmation, 27.7 percent for Strauss and 9.1 percent did not feel qualified to give an opinion. As Secretary of Commerce, Strauss would exercise an important influence in science through the U. S. Bureau of Standards, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Weather Bureau which are all in the Department of Commerce. Independent research by Weather Bureau scientists proved the AEC wrong on the distribution of fallout and observations by Coast and Geodetic Survey showed the AEC had misinformed the public on the first underground nuclear test.

When Chairman Cannon angrily asked Strauss, "Why was this not mentioned to us?", Strauss replied, "It was. It was stated that this fast breeder was the most hazardous of all reactors."

"The gentleman did not mention," Cannon said reproachfully, "that there had been no approval of the design on that account." "We were trying to make our answers responsive to the questions," Strauss countered slickly.

Another Abuse of "Confidential"

Carey put into the record the text of a telegram from Governor Williams of Michigan to Admiral Strauss demanding access to the adverse safety report. A reply next day from the AEC said "The Commission considers it would be inappropriate to disclose the contents of internal documents developed by its staff." The adverse report was stamped confidential and only became public the following October when Commissioner Murray appended a copy of the adverse report to a dissenting opinion.

The unions filed suit in August, 1956, challenging the validity of a conditional construction permit. The State of Michigan joined in as intervenor. But almost three years have passed and the AEC has not yet issued a final ruling on the suit. This must be made before it can be appealed to the courts. Construction of the plant is 90 percent completed.

Carey testified that Strauss tried to give Detroit Edison a hidden subsidy of almost $16,000,000 by guaranteeing to buy its plutonium output for ten years at $45 a gram. The price was "classified" but the secret was uncovered by the unions in their suit. The AEC thereupon reduced the price to $30 a gram. The British were only paying $12 a gram at the time, and expected the price to go lower.

Setting the Record Straight on the Dixon-Yates Power Contract

Lewis L. Strauss, defending the Dixon-Yates contract before the Senate Commerce Committee: "It would have cost the people a great deal less than the plant is now going to cost."

The facts, as dug up by Elsie Carper, Washington Post staff (May 17): The publicly owned Memphis, Tenn., plant will cost 13 percent more than the projected Dixon-Yates plant but generates 15 percent more power. The Dixon-Yates plant would have cost $165 per kilowatt of capacity, the Memphis municipal plant is costing $161.33.

"The Memphis plant is being built at no cost to the Federal taxpayer while under Dixon-Yates," the Washington Post reported, "the Government was obligated to spend 6.5 million for transmission lines and guarantee Dixon-Yates a profit."

Though Memphis had to float revenue bonds at 4.4 percent to finance the plant, it expects operation to be profitable at TVA rate levels. Interest and amortization will be paid out of revenue, and the cost is expected to be paid off entirely by 1992.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Teller: It Would Hamper Science and Murray: It Would Hurt Morality

Warning Bulletin: A New Scare Campaign to Block A Test Agreement

In 1956, just as an agreement with the Russians on testing seemed imminent, Edward Teller turned up on the White House lawn with the clean bomb plea. Now he is making the rounds of important editors with the same worn gimmick. The only important question which now separates East and West on a test agreement is the number of veto-free inspections. The compromise Senator Humphrey suggested on March 5 to the President (see the text and Humphrey's important but neglected speech in the *Congressional Record* for March 12) and the similar compromise Macmillan suggested during his visit at the time to the Kremlin have borne fruit. Now, as on other occasions when agreement on disarmament seemed possible, the opposition is mobilizing suspicion, hate, fear and ignorance; all the appalling irrationality of mankind is being mustered.

The Morality of Murder by Kiloton

Teller is telling the editors that an agreement would hamper science and Thomas E. Murray is telling us it would be downright immoral. Even the *Washington Post* (May 19) suddenly fears "It is not beyond speculation that they," i.e. the Russians, "would use a test agreement as a peg for a propaganda offensive to ban the use of nuclear weapons." That *would* be wicked. Mr. Murray in a memorandum to Senator Clinton P. Anderson appeals in anguish to "first moral principles" against the drift to agreement.

Mr. Murray is back on his familiar theme, which is that mass murder by megaton may be wrong (unless necessary of course as a last resort against heathen Muscovy) but mass murder by kiloton is moral. He wants continued testing and sees "a rational test program, safely conducted . . . as a means of moral education as well as of military security." Even Mr. Dulles could hardly have surpassed Mr. Murray's climactic exhortation to "a sound philosophy of the uses of nuclear force in the furtherance of the American purpose," the reorganization of the world on "the principles which God Himself has established for the rule of human societies."

This rhapsodical self-righteousness by a man who is supposed to be consultant to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee on nuclear engineering, not nuclear theology, is a little more than the Joint Committee dares yet espouse in public. A majority of its members tried to block the Humphrey resolution for test cessation in private but none dared vote against it in public when it passed the Senate unanimously on April 30. Congressman John S. Monagan (*D. Conn.*) has introduced it in the House where they will try to keep it from the floor for the same reasons; the nuclear warriors fear to stand up and be counted against it. Somehow the American people refuse to swallow the nonsense about clean bombs and the Jesuitical argument that nuclear weapons, at least the little Hiroshima size fellows, are instruments of moral persuasion. But we are on the verge of a new scare campaign against a testing agreement.

In the Army as Well as The Womb

"I assure you that a pregnant woman's normal fears are multiplied by the thought that her unborn child might be deformed by invisible particles coming from bombs manufactured and tested by her fellow men."

—Mrs. Lucille Harris, a pregnant mother, testifying on behalf of the Washington Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, May 18, Senate subcommittee on HEW Appropriations, asking more funds for fallout research by the Public Health Service.

"It is possible that the average body burden of Sr-90 in young children over much of the U. S. could rise to 10 strontium units from testing to date. . . . In this country there would occur not more than 500 greater or lesser tragedies of this nature ["genetic defects, stillbirths and the like"] to add to the some 1400 fatalities and a large number of serious injuries each year readily identifiable with other aspects of our defense efforts."

—Dr. Charles L. Dunham, Division of Biology and Medicine, AEC, opening the radiation hearings, May 5.

We might even award such babies a Purple Heart, with a citation reading, "Deformed for Defense."

1958 Index Ready Free If You Send A Long Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope For It

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional: 5/25/59

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.
NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED